DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 363 CE 063 443

TITLE	A Basis for Credit? Developing a Post-16 Credit Accumulation and Transfer Framework. Feedback and Developments.
INSTITUTION	Further Education Unit, London (England).
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-85338-294-9
PUB DATE	Feb 93
NOTE	9p.; For the related discussion paper, see ED 344 048.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Adult Education; Articulation (Education); *Credits; Curriculum Development; Educational Certificates; Educational Change; *Educational Development; Foreign Countries; *National Programs; Open Universities; Postsecondary Education; *Transfer Policy; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Further Education Unit (England)

ABSTRACT

This bulletin is an update of Britain's Further Education Unit (FEU) activities associated with the continuing development of a post-16 national credit and accumulation transfer (CAT) framework proposed in February 1992. It begins with a summary of feedback from the field: the central proposition--the need for a post-16 CAT system--was enthusiastically and widely endorsed; strong support for a national CAT framework was indicated; the question of the need for grading was raised; the credit-based approach was seen as a powerful tool for making changes in curriculum content, methods of delivery, and assessment within institutions; and real dilemmas were indicated about the appropriate structure/organization at a national level. The next section discusses development initiatives FEU is mounting as a result of the positive response: background papers relating to crucial technical issues, an international survey of credit systems, and relevance of a credit framework to the pre-16 phase and establishment of a national network to support and link up colleges involved in credit-based developments. The bulletin also reports on three initiatives: (1) a national CAT development project to research the potential of credit-based learning to provide fundamental change in higher and further education; (2) Open College Networks that provide accreditation for those programs outside mainstream qualifications; and (3) credit framework developments in Wales and across the country. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A BASIS FOR CREDIT?

February 1993

DEVELOPING A POST-16 CREDIT ACCUMULATION AND TRANSFER FRAMEWORK

FEEDBACK AND DEVELOPMENTS

ED356363

FOREWORD

This is FEU's second publication on a national credit and accumulation transfer (CAT) framework. It follows the consultative one issued in February 1992, and reflects the continuing thinking of the Unit's staff on the issues, and the widespread support expressed for the ideas.

A Basis for Credit? drew on the ideas of many and was never intended as a definitive set of rules. There was, however, very little disagreement with the framework proposed. Whether the primary interest is in curriculum planning, qualification reform, increasing access, encouraging progression, or achievement-led resourcing, there is obvious agreement that we would all benefit from a common language and currency to describe the achievement of learners.

The key notions of the CAT framework provide ways in which different sectors, institutions, and interests can talk to each other. A common language is built by agreement and sharing of ideas and debate, not by imposition from above. FEU is seeking to help develop such a language, by exploring the issues and implications at a variety of levels, by bringing together interested parties, by developing specific tools and approaches.

This bulletin marks the beginning of a new phase of our work. FEU goes forward encouraged by the widespread support received, and looks forward to working with many more people in the next stage.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N McGoff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 063 443

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT WAS SAID

'A national credit framework is essential for several reasons. The development of Records of Achievement will increasingly provide an impetus from schools which is being echoed at HE level. The difficulty at present is that the existing resistance to such a framework is fuelled by claims that a local credit framework will have no validity in the eyes of employers, HE, schools, etc. The only practical way to provide the flexibility that is demanded and sought is to agree a national framework. From a public relations point of view it would be better to eliminate the existing confusion which gives people outside the education system easy ammunition.'
Airedale and Wharfdale College

'In the view of managers of Loxley College this is about the best news we have had in 12 months... We think that a 16+ CATS scheme is very desirable. The current differences between full- and part-time programmes seem to us to be becoming increasingly irrelevant hence a credit system which will allow more mix and match, accumulation over time and accumulation by different modes.'
Loxley College

'It's a pleasure to respond to a discussion paper which opens up so many exciting prospects for curriculum harmonisation and which offers such a practical way forward for bridging the academic-vocational divide (a crucial need which is so often used merely as a slogan).'
Lewisham College

'We welcome the leadership of FEU in proposing the establishment of a common framework encompassing all post-16 qualifications, with the reservation that the paper proposes one credit equivalent to 30 hours' student input whereas the base being adopted in HE is 7.5 hours.

'The proposals are most welcome from the point of view of admissions tutors who, faced with an increasing spread of post-16 qualifications, need every assistance they can obtain in evaluating the different types of qualification.'
University of Nottingham

'A recent paper for discussion entitled *A Basis for Credit?* produced by FEU, sets out both an elegant description of the convergence of many elements of the new qualifications emerging from the eighties re-organisation and a useful indicator of the decisions yet to be taken.'
Training Tomorrow

'We welcome the intention to progress towards a common framework encompassing all qualifications post 16. Like you we wis to promote flexibility and coherence and believe that learners should receive public accreditation for their achievements.'
NCVQ

'The aims of the FEU paper are to be supported, i.e. to allow people to gain credit for what they have studied and to transfer freely between courses both academic and vocational. This can only benefit individuals.'
Sheffield TEC

'The pragmatism of the paper is helpful in that it takes as its starting point the realities of the current position acknowledging th strengths of the different traditions of academic and vocational qualifications and the pervasive influence of validating and examination bodies.'
Kingston upon Thames LEA

'The New Zealand Qualifications Authority, which has responsibility for all national qualifications in the post-compulsory education and training sector from school leaving certificates to degrees, has reached independently many of your conclusions.'
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

INTRODUCTION

A Basis for Credit? proposed a post-16 CAT framework encompassing all curriculum and qualifications from key stage 4 of the National Curriculum/adult basic education to post-graduate level qualifications in HE/professional qualifications. It argued that such a framework would enable the development of flexible curriculum, qualifications and methods of delivery relevant and appropriate to the needs of the UK in the twenty-first century.

The paper also argued that the system might develop from below as an open system rather than being imp by a single central body or agency.

A Basis for Credit? was an attempt at:

- making a case for an overarching post-16 CAT framework;
- offering a common language for expressing achievement across a range of subject/vocational ar covering FE, AE and HE phases and with potential alignment with the National Curriculum as well;

- establishing the credit as a common currency for achievement in post-16 education;
- proposing a mechanism for ascribing a credit value to different kinds of learning achievement.

The paper was widely disseminated throughout the post-16 system. It invited both general comments and answers to a series of specific questions related to the proposals.

This bulletin is an update of FEU activities associated with the continuing development of a post-16 CAT framework as proposed in *A Basis for Credit?*. It also reports on:

- feedback from the field: from institutions in the FE, HE, secondary sectors, TECS, LEAs, leading national bodies/agencies and many others involved in post-16 education;
- new FEU development initiatives;
- national CAT developments in HE, Open College Networks (OCNs), Wales, and other significant developments across the country;
- launch of a national CAT network to support and link colleges involved in credit-based developments.

FEEDBACK FROM THE FIELD

FEU received an exceptionally high number of responses including many detailed written statements from FE colleges, universities and other HE institutions, LEAs, TECs and major national agencies/organisations involved in post-16 education. FEU has also drawn on feedback derived from other pieces of related development work and conferences, workshops and meetings involving FEU development staff. There has also been contact from outside the UK, including a response from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority which is establishing a CAT system remarkably similar to that proposed in *A Basis for Credit?*

The feedback has been grouped below under headings relating to the main sections of *A Basis for Credit?* and the questions it asked.

General comments

The central proposition of the paper — the need for a post-16 CAT system — was enthusiastically and widely endorsed. A few respondents took issue with particular aspects of the proposals. However, from the hundreds of written and oral responses FEU received, there were only a few which took issue with the broad aim of creating such a system. Phrases such as a 'high priority', 'essential', 'most relevant' and 'vital' recur in the documentation.

There was a clear indication of strong support for a national CAT framework encompassing achievement in the schools system, FE, AE and HE. It was seen as offering a way forward in developing a 14–19 approach to transition and progression, and overcoming the divide at 16.

There has also been some interest in the significance the credit, as defined in the paper, could have for the development of new approaches to resourcing and funding. While this is acknowledged as a possibility, some respondents were anxious about the implications of using a framework developed for one purpose, coherence for post-16 curriculum and qualifications, being used for another, quite different one, funding and resource allocation. The difficulties experienced in using NVQs as a measure of output-related funding underline this.

Foundations of the framework

The proposed definitions of outcomes, units and credits were generally accepted and considered to be a sensible and pragmatic basis on which to proceed with further development work.

The method of credit valuation and the choice of 30 hours learning time also proved broadly acceptable. There has been a certain amount of concern that notional time will be confused with actual time-on-task or actual teaching time and that this could undermine the outcomes-based approach. FEU remains open to suggestions of better ways of defining credit than use of notional time — it is the best mechanism developed so far, not a creed! Overall, however, the approach was widely endorsed and as one respondent commented 'the use of notional time may be regrettable but it is inescapable'.

There was also a small amount of criticism of the choice of 30 hours used to define the credit. Other figures have been suggested which it is claimed will lead to greater flexibility and cause less of the kind of confusion described above. Though there were individual suggestions, ranging from 10 to 120, most respondents took the view that 30 was as good a number of hours as any, especially as it is already widely used. In any case, conversion of credits based on one figure rather than another need only be a matter of simple multiplication or division.

It was widely acknowledged that agreement on the approach to credit rating was far more important than any particular figure.

Illustrative examples

It was pointed out that the example in *A Basis for Credit?*, which gave a level 3 GNVQ a lower credit rating than two A levels could lead to misunderstandings. Level 3 GNVQs are specifically designed to be equivalent to more than two A levels. It was also pointed out that the examples do not acknowledge that in fact, qualifications may well include units at more than one level. This is particularly true in the GNVQ framework where core skills may be at a different level to the vocational units.

Levels

The definition and number of levels to embrace curriculum and qualifications from Key Stage 4/basic education to HE post-graduate/professional qualifications raised various issues.

Equivalence between NVQs (which are based on levels derived from the degree of responsibility in the workplace) and educational qualifications (which use

different criteria for determining levels) is problematic. The equivalences suggested in *A Basis for Credit?*, which were drawn from the White Paper *Education and Training in the 21st Century*, were seen as a pragmatic starting point, but a far from perfect solution.

Concern was also expressed about the need for the structure to be sufficiently deep to include achievement in adult basic education as well as for people with learning difficulties.

The need for a single CAT system spanning the FE and HE phase was widely endorsed. The growth of access courses, 2+2 degrees, franchising and local progression agreements is making boundaries between the two sectors blurred and unstable.

It was acknowledged that any system of levels would be problematic and that further work on this was needed. It was also recognised that for the system to work its users would have to commit themselves to arrangements that were pragmatic rather than platonic! It is therefore expected that a pragmatic approach will be recommended in the first instance with further theoretical and evaluative work leading to refinements. In a forthcoming paper to be published by FEU an approach to definition of a framework of levels is suggested (see page 5). Care is required to ensure that long-term needs are not sacrificed for short-term imperatives.

Grading

The question of the need for grading was raised especially from the HE sector where many see it as essential for selection processes. The proposed framework is in fact neutral on this question. The framework cannot include grading as a specification without excluding NVQs, OCNs, etc. This makes it possible for the framework to include units which contain grading criteria and those which do not.

Parity and equivalence

The feedback also recognised that the definition of credit proposed in the paper values and expresses academic and vocational achievement in the same way, even if the achievement is not of the same type. This was seen as being significant in challenging outdated and élitist notions that some kinds of achievement are worth more than others and valid learning only occurring in particular contexts and learning environments.

The fact that the credit is attached to a set of outcomes at a specified level makes it possible to talk about equivalence between units without any claim that they are the same.

Developing curriculum and improving flexibility and quality

The credit-based approach was seen as a powerful tool for making changes in curriculum content, methods of delivery and assessment within institutions. It was seen as offering a way forward on modularisation and creating a context in which learners would be able to construct more appropriate and flexible learning programmes.

It was also seen as offering:

- a means of establishing progression routes within and between institutions;
- a curriculum planning framework at an institutional level;
- a means of measuring added value in education;
- a mechanism for improving accountability;
- a means of analysing stages and levels within courses and programmes.

A number of institutions have already begun to adopt a credit-based approach to institutional development. Some of these are reported on in greater detail in the section on national CATS developments on page 6.

Qualifications and diplomas/baccalaureate

There was considerable interest in the possibilities of using the credit framework to develop new qualifications and other awards. In particular, employing the credit-based approach for the development of an advanced diploma or baccalaureate which could play a key role in encouraging a post-16 core, broadening the 16–19 curriculum and establishing a base-line for progression into HE and employment was seen as a potential benefit.

Open system approach

Feedback indicated real dilemmas about what kind of structure/organisation at a national level would be most appropriate. The success of the CNAA CAT arrangements in HE seems to be associated with its pragmatism and its voluntary nature. It might well be counterproductive and perhaps impossible to impose a CAT framework on FE institutions, universities, training organisations and professional bodies. At the same time there are anxieties about adopting too weak or loose a form of organisation which might not be able to establish national credibility or currency.

There was also concern about a proliferation of different CAT systems if a central lead is not given.

Further development

The advice offered to FEU on further development of the proposal was that the crucial areas are:

- definition of outcomes;
- definition and number of levels;
- systems for quality assurance and accreditation;
- definition of types of unit;
- national organisation/structure;
- credit-based 16–19 diploma/baccalaureate;
- relationship with other CAT systems established in Scotland and North America, developing in Europe, Australia and New Zealand.

NEW FEU DEVELOPMENTS

As a result of the positive response received to *A Basis for Credit?* FEU is mounting a number of development initiatives aimed at taking this work forward. These include:

- establishing a national network to support and link up colleges involved in credit-based developments (RP739, further details below);
- technical studies to clarify the crucial issues of definition of outcomes, definition and number of levels, systems for quality assurance and accreditation, system for categorisation of units into types, national organisation/structure, etc. (RP770);
- publication of a volume of background papers relating to the post-16 CAT framework and exploring various aspects of the proposals including some of the crucial technical issues, an international survey of credit systems, the relevance of a credit framework to the pre-16 phase, the ways it could be used to develop a system of advanced diplomas and certificates (RP710, further details below);
- college-based feasibility studies in a number of further education institutions — GLOSCAT, Deeside College, Shipley College, Solihull College, Suffolk College and Tameside College (RP711, see further details page 8);
- a joint credit-based HE progression initiative with Leicestershire LEA involving a number of FE and sixth-form colleges and three local universities (RP713, see further details page 7);
- Credit Framework and A Levels: joint FEU project with the University of London Examination and Assessment Council (RP768);
- liaison with national agencies/organisations involved in post-16 education to consider the ways in which the proposal contributes to other national initiatives;
- projects to explore and develop links between the diverse existing and developing credit systems, including OCNs and NVQs and OCNs and HE CATS (see further details page 6).

For information on this area of activity contact Tony Tait or Caroline Mager, Lead Development Officers, Post-16 CAT Framework at FEU.

DISCUSSING CREDIT

During the course of FEU's work on the post-16 CAT proposals, a number of background papers to support developmental activities were commissioned. These were not originally intended for publication but interest in the proposals suggests they will be useful to a wide and growing audience. FEU is therefore publishing a number of them as a collection of occasional papers. Included in the collection are:

- an international overview and history of the development of credit systems by Professor David Robertson, Liverpool John Moores University;
- a technical discussion of a number of the central issues of *A Basis for Credit?* including notional time, credit rating and an approach to levels by Peter Wilson, Leicestershire OCN;
- a proposal for an advanced diploma based on a National Credit Framework by Bob Rainbow, Wessex Project;
- a description of the Islington HE Link initiatives and the ways they could be developed through a credit framework Andrew Morris, Islington Sixth Form Centre;
- a discussion of the CAT proposals and their significance for 14–16 developments by John Wilmut, Modular Information Network.

The publication, *Discussing Credit: a collection of occasional papers relating to the FEU proposal for a post-16 CAT framework*, and *A Basis for Credit?* are available from the Information Centre at FEU.

For further details, contact Tony Tait at FEU.

NATIONAL CREDIT NETWORK

The responses to *A Basis for Credit?* showed the extent of interest in a post-16 CAT framework. A growing number of institutions are using a credit-based approach for activities, such as institutional planning, curriculum development, modularisation, and progression arrangements within and beyond the institution.

Some colleges like Llandrillo, Solihull and Wirral have begun to use the credit-based approach, in some cases, in advance of the publication of *A Basis for Credit?* For others, the paper helped to crystallise their thinking and is seen as preparing ways forward in a number of areas. In a short space of time almost 50 colleges have approached FEU with an interest in being involved in this developing area of work.

A clear message from the feedback FEU has received is that colleges involved in credit-based developments want to share information and ideas about their work in this area and to keep in contact with FEU as proposals are refined and developed. Colleges are all very conscious of the need for collaboration to ensure that developments are nationally consistent in order to make credit accumulation and transfer possible. As a result, FEU launched a national CAT network in December 1992. It aims to:

- link colleges involved in credit-based developments of the kind outlined in *A Basis for Credit?*;
- share experience, key issues and approaches between institutions and encourage mutual support;
- disseminate findings and recommendations of continuing research and development work by FEU and others in this area;
- provide feedback to the FEU about issues of implementation and development.

For further details, contact Caroline Mager at FEU.

Higher Education: National CATS Development Project

The newly-established Higher Education Quality Council has approved the formation of a national CATS development project. This will carry out exploratory research into the potential of credit-based learning to promote fundamental change in higher and further education. Results from the project will assist institutions, national agencies and government departments in determining the extent to which credit systems can be helpful in generating more flexible and choice-based learning opportunities. Further policy recommendations are expected to follow the project as it completes its work. It will report by the end of 1993.

The focus of the project is wide-ranging. Quality assurance arrangements form a central part of the investigative work; attention will be paid to the means by which the quality of portable credits can be assured as students transfer between different institutions and as they earn credit for off-campus (e.g. work-based or experiential) learning.

Components of a national credit framework will be identified. Investigations will focus upon proposals to bring together different existing credit frameworks including those derived from the CNAA, NCVQ, OCNs and *A Basis for Credit?*. Part of this process will involve the development of a taxonomy of credit systems in order to codify how different bodies understand credit-based learning.

The project will address the potential within credit systems for the development of a rational resource management method. The effect of student choice upon sector and institutional resource distribution patterns will be of immediate concern together with the extent to which student mobility is affected by current financial regulatory arrangements.

The effect of credit systems upon the student learning experience, upon academic values and institutional culture, upon institutional management arrangements and for international exchange will be important additional features of the project. Recommendations will address the connections between increased student choice, curriculum change and the management priorities to be established if institutions elect to develop credit systems.

Lastly, the project will determine the means by which credit-based learning may be better promoted among students, employers and institutions.

Proposals from the project are intended to assist the HEQC Division for Credit and Access in planning its agenda for work with institutions, while the dissemination of the outcomes of the final report are expected to inform the national policy community on strategies for further development of credit-based learning.

The project will invite extensive contributions from higher and further education and interested parties are invited to contact Professor David Robertson, Project Director, Liverpool John Moores University, Rodney House, 70 Mount Pleasant, Liverpool L3 5UX (051-231 3534).

Open College Networks

OCNs include a wide range of providers of education and training within a local area — further and higher education institutions, adult and community education, TECs, voluntary sector, private and public employers. OCNs provide accreditation primarily for those programmes, offered by their members, which lie outside mainstream qualifications and award credits to learners who achieve the relevant outcomes.

The rationale that underpins the operation of OCNs is that adult learners, particularly those least confident in formal education and training, often join education programmes in local, familiar centres with provision targeted to meet their needs. Unfortunately, the price that is often paid for local flexibility and targeting, is lack of both transferability and recognition of the outcomes achieved on the programme.

OCNs offer an accreditation system for this provision which does not restrict its flexibility or targeting, but which is rigorous and offers a recognisable currency for their achievement.

The work of OCNs is linked to FEU's work on a credit framework, since OCNs operate an accreditation framework similar to that outlined in *A Basis for Credit?*. Programmes are accredited for an agreed number of credits according to the notional learning time required to achieve the outcomes of the programme (one credit is awarded for the outcomes achieved in 30 notional hours of learning), and these are awarded at a particular level within a framework of four levels from basic communications skills at Level 1 to an equivalent to GCE A level at Level 4.

OCNs are linked nationally through the National Open College Network (NOCN). Members of NOCN must apply the NOCN Accreditation Framework, and are part of a national quality assurance network which ensures its consistent application across all networks. There are currently nine members and 11 associates of NOCN covering the whole of Wales and some 370 colleges of further and higher education across England and Wales.

A survey undertaken by UDACE before its merger with FEU explored learner participation and progression in two OCNs (Manchester and London). The survey sought to explore both the subjective views of learners about OCN credits and objective data about actual progression. The research demonstrates that the vast majority of respondents thought that receiving credits was important, and they associate credits with enhanced value, higher quality, and increased recognition by others. The majority of respondents said that OCN credits helped to boost their confidence and heighten their

ambitions, and this was particularly so among respondents who were black, female and over 35 years old. A report on this work will soon be available.

FEU has a range of developmental work and publications relating to OCNs.

From Authorised Validating Agency to Open College Network (RP721)
This project has been developed in response to the growing number of Authorised Validating Agencies (AVAs) for access to HE, wishing to broaden their activities to become OCNs. This will enable them to provide accreditation for a broader range of learning routes and will bring them within a credit-based system. The project will provide guidelines, checklists and models for other AVAs wishing to become OCNs.

Widening Access to NVQs through Open College Networks (RP726)
This project is exploring ways in which units of NVQs embedded within OCN-accredited programmes delivered in community, voluntary, adult education and college centres can be recognised towards an NVQ by developing agreements with national awarding bodies.

The following publications on OCNs are available from FEU:

Open College Networks: The Handbook — £25.00
OCNs: Current Developments and Practice
Open College Networks: Area Contacts
Assessment in Open College Networks

Project information bulletins on the projects identified above are also available from the Information Centre.

FEU OCN Development Officer: Caroline Mager

Credit framework developments in Wales

In Wales the ideas contained in *A Basis for Credit?* have been adopted by five colleges which are part of the TEED/Welsh Joint Education Council (WJEC) project, Towards a Flexible FE System for Wales. This project has now entered Phase II as a Welsh Office/WJEC project, with additional funding of £100,000.

Phase II membership of the project has been extended to seven colleges, but because so much interest was shown in the bidding stage, the Welsh Office Modularity Management Group has decided that limited unfunded support in the form of access to papers, module specifications, attendance at development meetings and so on should be extended to all colleges in Wales. Attendance at the launch of Phase II included representation from some 16 institutions in Wales. Module specifications which are developed will be available to all participant colleges through a common database.

A number of colleges involved in Phase II have started to discuss establishing regional credit forums. Their terms of reference are not yet clear, but it is likely that they will act as mutual support structures, and this could be the beginnings of collaboration for mutual quality control, ascribing credit and levels, and negotiating accumulation and credit transfer for the shared units which they develop.

In addition there are a number of separate initiatives emerging which will be concerned with modularisation and credit frameworks. Gwent TEC is funding Gwent Tertiary College for a very substantial modularisation project and other TECs, notably Mid Glamorgan and West Wales, have expressed an interest in doing similar work. Members of the Welsh Office Modularity Management Group have agreed to seek further funding to include schools in linked developments, and a proposal has been submitted to the Welsh Office by members of Curriculum Council for Wales (CCW), HMI, WJEC and TEED.

Further details available from Jim Bennett, FEU Regional Development Officer for Wales.

In brief...

Leicestershire LEA
In Leicestershire, a partnership between six FE and sixth-form colleges and the three universities in the county is exploring and testing the feasibility of FEU's CAT framework proposals.

The project will test the feasibility of credit rating a range of existing post-16 awards and qualifications within the proposed framework. It will also develop and validate a limited range with alternative learning opportunities for students aiming to progress to HE in a variety of areas, including medical science, business studies, chemistry, economics, general science, engineering, information studies/computing, politics and social science.
Contact: Neil Stock, Leicestershire LEA

Llandrillo College
The college is currently modularising its whole curriculum and ascribing credits and to all units. The target date for completion of this process is July 1993. The Unit specification used by the college draws on the model proposed in *A Basis for Credit?*.

Llandrillo College has recognised the need to network in order to increase the usefulness and enhance the credibility of their work. It is largely due to its initiative that the North Wales Credit Forum has been established.
Contact: Guido d'Isidoro, Llandrillo College

'London Together' and a credit framework
'London Together' is a group of leading employers and representatives from the University of London, University of Westminster, City University, University of North London and other providers of higher, further and adult education, working in colloboration for the benefit of London. It regards the development of a credit framework for the capital region, along the lines suggested in *A Basis for Credit?*, as crucial to this.

'London Together' has set up working parties that involve universities and other HE bodies, FE institutions and the principal A-level, vocational, adult and HE

awarding bodies. These groups are exploring the issues raised by the concept of a single credit system encompassing all existing qualification structures.
Contact: Barbara Anderson, Head of Public Affairs, University of London

Solihull College
Solihull College is currently developing an internal CAT system called the Assessment Framework. Most curriculum areas have submitted some units for validation on this system and the college aims to extend coverage so that all provision is unitised and placed on a computerised network by September 1994.

Solihull College is also carrying out a feasibility study for FEU as part of RP711.
Contact: Liz Martin, Solihull College

Unified 16+ Curriculum Project
The Paul Hamlyn Foundation has funded a project involving Islington Education Authority, City and Inner London North TEC, and the Institute of Education Post 16 Centre to explore practical ways of moving towards a more unified curriculum. The first phase of the project involved schools and colleges from Harrow, Croydon, Hackney, Camden, Warwickshire and also eight universities.

The project has used the specifications suggested in *A Basis for Credit?* to develop a module format that is being piloted in the areas of management education, careers education, performing arts and mathematics leading to engineering degrees. A prototype accreditation procedure is also being developed with support from FEU.

The second phase of the project will take the work forward in a number of schools and colleges and local universities in the Islington area.
Contact: Andrew Morris, Sixth Form Centre, Islington Federal College

Wirral Metropolitan College
The College has been developing its own credit accumulation and transfer system called the Learning Framework since 1989. The Learning Framework has the same characteristics as those specified in the *A Basis for Credit?* with the exception that the basic unit is of ten, rather than 30, notional hours.

More than 50% of the college curriculum has been mapped onto the Learning Framework and the remainder should be completed by the summer of 1993. Core skills units have also been identified corresponding to different programme levels.

The Learning Framework is available on the college's computer network, MettNet and has the potential of being transferred across institutions.
Contact: Maureen Hanley, Wirral Metropolitan College

FEU College-based Feasibility Studies (RP711)
FEU is funding six college-based feasibility studies exploring the applications of a credit-based approach within institutions and evaluating post-16 credit framework proposals. As well as addressing a number of common issues each college has a particular focus:

GLOSCAT — the CAT Framework and implementing GNVQs
Contact: Pru Taylor, Nikki Chandler

Shipley College — the CAT Framework and implementing cross-college modular structures
Contact: Stephanie Shields, Andrea Byrom

Solihull College — see above

Suffolk College — the CAT Framework and the FE/HE interface
Contact: Peter Funnell, Jenny Owen

Tameside College — the CAT framework and outcome measures for FE training and education programmes
Contact: Brian Spaul, Sally Drake

Deeside College — the CAT Framework and internal/external progression opportunities
Contact: David Thomas, Wil Edmunds

Comments and further information
If you want further information or have any comments to make about this publication contact Tony Tait, Lead Development Officer Post-16 CAT Framework, FEU, Spring Gardens, Citadel Place, Tinworth St, London SE11 5EH
Tel: 071-962 1280
Fax: 071-962 1266

A Basis for Credit? and other FEU publications are available from the Information Centre at the above address.

ISBN: 1 85338 294 9

FEU registered charity number 326347

Copyright © Further Education Unit

Reproduction in whole or in part of the contents of this publication is authorised for all non-commercial educational purposes, provided the source, i.e. FEU, is acknowledged. Rights reserved with regard to commercial reproduction of the contents.

Printed by Novaprint Partnership, Leicester